REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-17 and rejected claims 10-17. With this paper claims 10, 12 and 13 are amended based on a telephone conversation with the Examiner on May 29, 2007 and again on June 6, 2007, new claim 18 is added to the case, and claim 11 is canceled. Thus claims *1-10 and 12-18* are pending.

In the final Office action, claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph. The Office asserts that "the means in the claim lack an equivalent structure description in the specification."

Also, claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 USC §101, for allegedly not being directed to statutory subject matter.

In the telephone conversation with the Examiner on May 29, 2007, the Examiner indicated that a change to claims 10-14 to recite an ISIM would be sufficient to overcome these rejections because an ISIM is commonly understood to include a *processor*, and thus the claims would not be interpreted as reciting software *per se*. With this paper, the claims are changed so as to recite that a UE including a processor (which could be the processor providing the functionality associated with the ISIM described at page 6, beginning line 1[1]) configured to provide the functionality recited in the claims to a UE, and to recite a multimedia network including at least one processor configured to provide the functionality recited in the claims to the multimedia network.

---

[1] The application provides at page 6, line 1:

> The ISIM is responsible for keys, sequence numbers
> (SQNs), and other similar objects/ parameters tailored
> to the IMS. The security parameters handled by an ISIM
> are independent of corresponding security parameters
> for a User Services Identity Module (USIM).

In the telephone interview of June 6, 2007, the Examiner indicated that it is his preliminary opinion that claim 10 as amended here (and sent as a proposed claim prior to filing this paper) obviates all grounds for rejection, and that the changes made to claim 12 may be sufficient to do same, although it may be advantageous to further recite a memory storage for holding instructions for providing the first and second program interfaces. With this paper, such a memory storage is now recited in new claim 18.

It is believed that the specification provides support for the changes since besides clearly indicating an ISIM as a component of a UE in Figure 1, the application at page 14, beginning line 1 provides:

> The invention is practiced by a *digital communication system* and a *UE communicating via such a communication system*. The UE can be any of several kinds. In TS 33.203, the UE is a mobile terminal MT (cellular phone). However, other kinds of UEs can advantageously practice the invention as well, including UEs without an integral MT component, but attached to an external MT, such as a laptop computer attached to a MT or to a mobile router, or other devices that communicate with a MT. It is important to understand that the list of devices given here is not intended to be exhaustive. In addition, some devices will not implement the complete functionality provided by the invention, but will support only a few services/ applications provided by the IMS. [Emphasis added.]

It is commonly known that a device communicating over a digital communication system must include a processor, which typically obtains instructions from a memory storage, and that the digital communication itself must include at least one such processor, and thus it is believed that the changes to the claims are supported by the disclosure. Further, it is respectfully asserted that one skilled in the art, when reading the application at page 14, would understand that a UE according to the invention, and a multimedia network according to the

invention, must both include at least one such processor (which, though could be provided as an application specific integrated circuit in embodiments where throughput is paramount, in which case there would be no memory storage required).

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that all the rejections under 35 USC §101 and also under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

6 June 2007
Date

James A. Retter
Registration No. 41,266

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

tel: (203) 261-1234
Cust. No.: 004955